[26th March 1929

(*c*) whether the Government have considered the undesirability of thus depriving the children of this congested area of the only open space available to them for play;

(*d*) whether the playgrounds used by school children in any other place in Madras City have similarly been taken away in the course of this year; and

(*e*) whether the Government will lay on the table of the House a copy of the correspondence that took place recently between them and the Physical Education Committee regarding such a question?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The Government propose to reserve for a model playground an adjoining plot which opens on to the Portuguese Church Street.

(*d*) No playground formally assigned has been resumed. There are, however, certain cases where private schools are allowed to use vacant Government land as playgrounds and in one such case Government has been compelled to withdraw the permission as the land is required for public purposes.

(*e*) The letters [a] referred to are laid on the table.

Mr. F. E. JAMES :—" Will the hon. the Minister be pleased to state, with reference to (*c*), whether the Government have already reserved that plot and if so, whether it is larger or smaller than the previous one."

11-45 a.m. The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. F. E. JAMES :—" May I ask whether he will consider the advisability of Government's adopting a policy of not resuming plots which are set aside as playgrounds until alternative plots have been laid down ? "

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" In this case, the alternative plot has been set down before the resumption."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the alternative plot is not as big as the other plot which they have resumed and also of the fact that it is not located in a place which is accessible to the people of the locality from which the other plot which was resumed ? "

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I do not think so. The new plot is adjacent to the old plot and is very easily accessible."

[*Note.*—An asterisk * at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

II

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1929-30.

DEMAND VI—IRRIGATION.

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

' *that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs.* 40,000 *under Demand VI—Irrigation.* "

This is to provide for improvements to the Vizzeswaram head sluice, Godavari Western delta.

[a] Printed as Appendix III on pages 920-921 infra.

26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is 'that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" On a point of order. I have already raised last year this question about further demands. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As far as the question of further demands is concerned, the hon. Member need not argue to reopen an established practice."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" You were pleased to rule last year that my contention about that further demands should cover only new matter; that is, you were pleased to agree with me on other points but you disagreed with me. . . "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I allowed further demands last year."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" There was one point, Sir, in your ruling which is to be found in the Proceedings of the Council in which you conceded my point, namely, that these further demands should cover new matter not contemplated at the time of the original budget; and, Sir, you were pleased to look into the subject-matter of the further demands last year and came to the conclusion, after satisfying yourself, that they covered new matter. May I submit, Sir, that this further demand and the next further demand do not cover new matter? These have not arisen since the framing of the budget for the next year. 'New matters' has been defined in the House of Commons by the Chairman of Committee, as a matter which must have arisen since the submission of the original estimates to the House. You will notice, Sir, that both, with regard to this and the next demand, the scheme was already included as Part II schemes for 1929-30. Paragraph 2 of the explanatory note says 'The Chief Engineer originally included the scheme in his list of Part II schemes which he submitted in October last but as then the estimate was not before the Government and as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II schemes.' I submit, Sir, that this is not a matter which has arisen since the submission of the original budget. The matter was before the Government and for their own reason they have put it aside, for the simple reason that the estimate was not ready."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not agree with the hon. Member."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With regard to the second further demand."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That will come later."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Am I to take it that in your opinion that this is a new matter?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Yes."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Then I decide to oppose this demand. Sir, a further demand is, I submit, under the present ruling of yours, an exceptional procedure to be resorted to by Government, only under exceptional circumstances. I am bound by your ruling that these demands are in order. Subject to that, I would argue that the House should examine the further demands and should not sanction any of them, unless they are satisfied that it is a matter which could not be included in the original budget.

"If the hon. Members will read the explanatory note, they will find that this is an old scheme which the Government had examined, and they should have been in a position to include it in the original budget itself, if they wanted to do so; and as a matter of fact, the Chief Engineer originally included the scheme in the list of Part II schemes, which he submitted to Government in October last, but then as the estimate was not before the Government and as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned, the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II scheme. Why was not the estimate then before the Government? Whose fault was it? I am particularly addressing my observation, if I may, to the hon. the Finance Member and the Finance Secretary, because after all they are the eyes and ears of this House so far as these budget estimates are concerned. If the department is lax in preparing estimates for the next year and have them included in the budget, are they to be encouraged to come here with a further demand? I can understand their doing so in unforeseen cases such as floods or famine or something of that sort. This procedure of bringing forward further demands should not be encouraged; otherwise the anxiety of the treasury to exercise control over the spending departments will be made nugatory. I should like to know why the estimate was not before the Government. Did the department commit any default in preparing estimates? Then, Sir, 'as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned.' May I know, Sir, whose sanction, is it the sanction of the Government or of the Finance Department or of the Finance Committee? Then, it says, the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II schemes. By whom was it deleted? Was it by the Government?

"The third paragraph says that 'the Chief Engineer submitted an estimate amounting to Rs. 1,21,000 for the scheme. It has been long delayed'. I agree. At the end of the third paragraph, the note says 'the season when the work has to be carried out is during the period of closure of the canals which is from 1st May'. This 1st of May, I hope, is a fixed date. That shows that the Government should have known that the canals would be closed from the 1st of May. They could have come forward with this demand earlier.

"It seems to me, Sir, that if further demands are to be encouraged by this House, the whole idea of the budget would become nugatory. As it is, there is no limit either in point of money or in point of objects or in point of time for further demands. Whereas excess demands and supplementary demands have got statutory restrictions placed upon them. The category of further demand, unless it is closely watched, may swallow up crores and crores of rupees. I submit, Sir, that unless the Finance Department scrutinises these demands very carefully, and unless those demands which could not be included in the original budget are only brought to this House, the control of this House which is already very limited will still further become nugatory. I therefore venture to submit to this House that this demand should be very carfully examined by the Finance Department and that an assurance should be given by the Finance Department that in spite of all the care on its part, it was impossible to include it in the original demand. Until this is done, we should oppose demands of this nature."

* Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am glad that my hon. Friend Mr. Satyamurti did not ask the House to reject this demand.

26th March 1929] [Mr. D. Narayana Raju]

Whatever may be the technical difficulties with regard to the rules for further demands, I hope the Council will pass this further demand. These improvements to the Vijjeswaram head sluice are long overdue. I am indeed glad that the Government have come forward at least now to effect these improvements. In this connexion, I would like to have some further information from the Government as to the nature of the improvements contemplated as to whether they intend to construct new vents or merely widen the existing ventways. I should also like to know what is the extra discharge that the Government hopes to provide by these improvements. I also want to know whether the Government have examined the question, whether the canals leading from the head sluice have got the necessary capacity to carry on the extra discharge and whether they contemplate any improvement to the canals also or not. I should like to have some information on these points."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, I can tell the hon. Member that the estimate contains provision for the construction of additional vents to the head sluice. With regard to other details he asked I regret I am not sufficiently familiar with engineering details to be able to say much. As has been stated in the explanatory note the Western delta has to work to a duty of 110, while the Eastern and the Central sections of the Godavari delta get supplies at a duty of 77 and 52: and the object is to increase the discharge to the Western delta: but I am sorry that I am unable to give details as to the exact amount of the extra discharge asked for by the Member. I can assure him that all these things have been very carefully worked out by the Chief Engineer and the scheme was laid before the Finance Committee for scrutiny."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The motion is that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant made.

DEMAND VIII—ELECTRICITY.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

> '*That the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs.* 3,56,400 *under Demand VIII—Electricity' to provide for additional expenditure on the Glen-Morgan Hydro-electric scheme in* 1929–30.

"The reasons for this demand are fully explained in the note that has been circulated to hon. Members. As a matter of fact the Chief Engineer has surrendered this amount that was provided for in the current year's budget to the Government. He could not spend it owing to obstruction to road traffic and also on account of the land slips in the Nilgiris Railway. There was also delay in obtaining the necessary machinery and plants. So, the proposal has practically to be taken to the next year."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Mr. President, Sir, I oppose this demand. I gave some of my reasons the other day when this demand came up for consideration in this House. Now, I find there are very many other reasons to show why this demand should be opposed. This scheme, I submit, Sir, never came before this House for consideration at all. There was an allotment in the last budget for about Rs. 10 lakhs for the Pykhara scheme and

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami] [26th March 1929

that provision was made last year. The predecessor of the present Law Member promised this House that there would be a big Pykhara scheme and that the scheme would supply not only electricity to various places but also to various concerns, the first and foremost being the South Indian Railway. He was informing this House that the Railway Company were negotiating with the Government to take a very big contract so that they might electrify their railways with the powers supplied from this scheme. The Government also promised at that time that a Paper Mill will be started at this place and there were materials there and that power would also be used for this purpose. The other day my friend the Law Member stated that there was really one scheme for starting a match industry near this place and the company with which they started negotiations did not agree to start any mill of that sort and that scheme failed.

12 noon. "Now, the only purpose for which this grant is asked is to supply electricity to Ootacamund tea plantations. Of course, whenever schemes of this sort are started the benefit is promised to other people also. In this case it is said that the Coimbatore Mills also will be benefited immediately and other places later on. The big Pykhara scheme has been split up into three parts and only one of these parts is proposed to be taken up now. When in the last budget funds were provided for the whole Pykhara scheme it was said that that scheme would supply electricity to many places including even Madras. Everybody was promised something under that scheme. (A voice: Northern Circars.) We do not want schemes of this sort for Northern Circars.

"Sir, the Government, instead of coming directly to this House with a demand for this scheme, converted a part of the amount sanctioned for the Pykhara scheme for use on this without the sanction of this House. This is the first time that the Glen-Morgan scheme comes before the House for consideration. I oppose this grant because I am quite sure that this money can be better spent on irrigation and other schemes. This scheme does not fetch more than 8 per cent. Further, I very much doubt whether the Government would not come again for a further grant for this same scheme saying that this amount is not sufficient. Again, Sir, there is no urgency in regard to this matter. The machinery for the purchase of which Rs. 4,74, 200 had been allotted did not arrive in time and the amount was not utilized. There is no urgency about it. I fear that even after the money is voted for this scheme and the work is completed, this House will be told that unless the other two parts are sanctioned the scheme could not be worked with any profit and therefore the House should vote for further demands also. In that way a huge sum will be spent on an object which will not give a return of more than 6 or 8 per cent. If this expenditure from provincial revenues is made for purposes of irrigation it would fetch more than 400 per cent. I oppose this demand."

* Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai :—"Sir, I beg to move—

'*To reduce the allotment of Rs.* 3,56,400 *for Electricity by Rs.* 100.'

"My object in moving this motion is to discuss the necessity for selecting members of the depressed and backward communities for appointment as clerks, etc. Sir, I do not know why a certain section of the Indian community is so largely employed under this scheme. As I have already said in this House, owing to economic conditions, the depressed classes are very badly off. Apart from that, whenever they go to the various offices

for employment, the insistence on qualifications blocks their way. I request the hon. the Law Member to kindly see that the members of my community are given a chance to serve as clerks, store-keepers, etc. I do not say that they may be given higher appointments or technical appointments as I know that specialists are required for such posts. They ought to have a knowledge of electricity."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"(After a pause.) For want of a seconder the motion is lost."

** Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—" Mr. President, Sir, I understand that this scheme is an auxiliary scheme to the big Hydro-electric (Pykhara) scheme which was originally intended to be started. The purpose of this scheme is not only to develop industries and electrify the railways, but also to improve irrigation. One of the essential requirements of the province is that we want cheap electricity. It is a dire necessity not only for industrial development, but also for various other purposes. Therefore, this Glen-Morgan scheme which the Engineer thinks would in course of time be self-supporting on account of the promises held out by the railways and the various industrial concerns, is likely to be a fruitful affair. And, as I pointed out it will also help irrigating the lands in the neighbourhood. The hon. Mr. Swami pointed out that electricity will be of use in the development of the match industry. We want cheap electric power for the development of our other industries also say, for our cottage industries. We want electricity for working aluminium industry, for working the aluminium ores great deal of heating power is required in the furnaces. We have plenty of aluminium ores in the country and with the generating power of electricity the industry can be developed to a greater extent. For preparing caustic soda necessary for soap-making, we also want electricity. Caustic soda is prepared by passing electricity through salt water by the process called electrolysus. You all know we have a soap factory and with the use of electricity caustic soda and other chemicals required not only for making soaps but also other things could be manufactured very cheaply. If we can get electricity cheap, we solve the fuel problem in respect of our industries. But according to Mr. Forbes' report, I find that the cost per unit of electricity will be about 0·8 annas or about 9 pies per unit. (Dr. B. S. Mallayya :—'We are paying 8 annas per unit.')

"According to Forbes' report, I may tell Dr. Mallayya that electricity by Pykhara scheme will cost only 8 pies for industrial purposes and 4 annas for lighting purposes per unit. I may in this connexion point out that this rate when compared with the rates prevailing in other parts of the world is high. In England the cost is only 3 pies per unit by making electricity out of coal; in Scandanavia, it is a bit more than a pie and in America it is less than a pie. Of course, our scheme is in its infancy and we cannot at this stage make comparisons with schemes of other countries. When our industrialists and agriculturists come forward offering to take electricity there will be the possibility of the cost being reduced. In any case in all parts of the world attempts are being made for generating current by harnessing water power. I therefore think that in the interests of industrial development in this country and in order to make a trial to see how far industrial as well as agricultural development is possible with the help of electricity we ought to support this demand. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting this motion of the hon. the Law Member."

[26th March 1929

* Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar:—"Sir, I am sorry that my hon. Friend has raised an objection to this demand. We will see how matters stand. Last year, the whole matter was discussed and a grant was made for 1928-29. This year again this question was discussed in connexion with a grant which was ultimately passed. It so happens that the original plan could not be carried out and the money not fully spent on account of some defects which were not anticipated. Therefore merely as a matter of adjustment and with a view to give effect to the various resolutions passed in connexion with the grants this adjustment is now asked for. No doubt the resolution originally passed by the House was for the whole Pykhara scheme. But the whole scheme is not now proposed to be carried out all at once. The scheme has been split into three parts and one part only is now proposed to be taken up. The present Chief Engineer has suggested that instead of spending a huge amount on the whole scheme at once it would be advisable to start work on one part of it to begin with, so that the investment on the first part may fetch some return. By this arrangement, each scheme as soon as it is completed, would pay interest. I believe that on this portion we are going to get about 8 per cent or so. The important question for consideration in connexion with this scheme is whether we should encourage the generation and utilization of hydro-electric power. We know what is being done in Bombay in this connexion and how it is progressing industrially. The City of Bombay which was once called the city of smoke is now full of light on account of the supply of electricity. If this electricity can be made available to our province, the cost of fuel and coal would go down. We have now to get coal from Bengal through the railways and our forests are being denuded of firewood trees. No doubt Coimbatore and other places outside the Nilgiris would not get power under this portion of the scheme; but this is only a part of the big scheme. If the railways agree to take power—probably the Railway Board is bargaining now and I am sure it will be the first to agree to utilize electricity for the railways—the scheme would be a thorough success and the fuel and coal which now go to feed the railways would be released and the cost of firewood would go down considerably. The mills in Coimbatore which now consume large quantities of fuel and coal have agreed to take electric energy for running the mills. As a matter of fact, those who know the spinning industry, know also that the yarn produced by electric power is better and finer than the yarn manufactured by steam. So, the supply of cheap electrical energy will also improve the textile industry. In any case if we look at the prosperous condition of the neighbouring State of Mysore brought about by the Sivasamudram Works, we need no argument to introduce the same in our province also.

12-15 p.m. "There is no doubt that one very reasonable objection was raised by Mr. Swami Nayudu the other day as well as to-day. Sometimes all this money is used for the purchase of big machinery from England. I appeal to this Government and to the hon. the Law Member to see that as much money as possible is spent on Indian-made goods. Recently, the Tariff Board has been asked to go into this question of having some import duties levied on some foreign wiring materials. I am sure that Messrs. Tata & Co. and some other Indian firms will be able to supply wiring materials and other materials that may be necessary. Unfortunately, we do not have big electrical machines made in India. But I suppose the starting of such big

power stations will give sufficient impetus for starting new factories. The paper manufacture referred to by Mr. Swami Nayudu, I believe, comes only under the Papanasam Hydro-electric works. That does not come under the Pykhara scheme. The Papanasam scheme will be taken into consideration a little later on when the Railway Board is prepared to take up some power produced there. The paper or match factory may be helping the Government to take up some energy. In any case, so far as the present scheme is concerned, this is only a part of the Pykhara. It will be a great benefit to this province and I request Mr. Swami Nayudu not to oppose it but to support the motion."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I rise again, not to speak on the merits of the scheme, but on the financial aspect of it, in the vain hope that by reiterating the argument again and again I shall be able to rouse the conscience of the Finance Department. This is a case where the spending department is not able to spend the amount granted to it, surrenders the amount and goes to the Finance Department saying that it wants a further demand for the sum it has surrendered this year. I should like to know some more facts than are given in the explanatory note. The estimated cost of this project is Rs. 12,20,600. The Chief Engineer for Hydro-electric Development expected to spend the sum of Rs. 8,30,600 during the current official year, and on this basis the balance of the estimate, viz., Rs. 3,90,000, was provided in the next year's budget. The House has already voted for Rs. 3,90,000 for this project. Then comes the intriguing sentence stating the transport difficulties brought about by slips on the roads and railways. I have a hazy recollection that these slips took place during the last monsoon which certainly was before the time when the budget was presented to this House. If all the expenditure could not be incurred owing to these slips on the railway lines and the roads, the spending department could have known that they could not spend the amount that year. Why did they not tell the House that they could not spend the money and wanted an extra sum for the next year? Then also they speak of the delay in the shipment of penstocks and electrical machinery from England. When was this delay? When did it come to the notice of the spending department? Did it come to its notice after the 2nd or 3rd March? Did the slips happen earlier? Were not the Government in a position to know and should they not be in a position to know how much they could spend for the rest of the year at least in January or February of this year? Was it necessary for them to wait till after the presentation of the budget and then say owing to shipping delays which must have been months before or owing to railway slips and road slips which took place six months before, the department could not spend it and therefore we come for a further demand? A sum of Rs. 3,56,400 has been surrendered by the Chief Engineer on this account. Sir, I am not quite familiar with the rules governing surrenders, but, as a layman, I believe that surrenders take place naturally after the official year is out. May I know whether there is any time-limit before which surrenders should be made? What is that limit? Was this amount surrendered before that date? If there is no time-limit, why has a date not been fixed so as to enable the Government to put the increased demand in the budget itself? If they cannot spend after the 1st March or some other date, they could have fixed a particular date before which the spending department could inform the Finance Department that so much of the year's grant could not be spent this year, and therefore they want provision to be made for the next year. Then, Sir, the other sentence:

[Mr. S. Satyamurti] [26th March 1929

is it necessary to increase the provision for next year by a corresponding amount ? How does it follow that they have any guarantee that the delay in the shipment of penstocks and electrical machinery ceased to exist or is it merely in the belief that they will again be surrendered and then can ask for a further demand ? Then, Sir, as the project is expected to be completed by September next, the commitment of the Government is that they will be able to spend nearly 7½ lakhs between the 1st April and the end of September, that is within six months. Is it, Sir, a provision based upon any knowledge of facts ? Have they got any knowledge in their possession to justify them in the belief that before the end of September next they will be able to spend Rs. 3,90,000 already provided for and also Rs. 3,56,400 which together make up 7½ lakhs ? Then, Sir, 'it is considered inadvisable to postpone the demand for the additional grant required for the next year till the next meeting of the Legislative Council which is not likely to be held before August next'. This is the first time I get the information. I do not know if your office has got any information about the date of the next meeting of the Legislative Council. The Government in their explanatory note for an additional provision for the Glen-Morgan Hydro-electric scheme say in an indirect manner, when the next meeting of the Council is to take place. I have no doubt any member of our party has heard and I do not think you have yourself heard when the Council is to be held. Supposing this is to be held some time in August, is there any guarantee according to the programme of work furnished by the Chief Engineer that he will be able to spend more than Rs. 3,90,000 before August next ? It is only on this basis that they can come now for a further demand. If, as a matter of fact, at least till the next meeting of the Legislative Council they are able to go on with a provision of Rs. 3,90,000, they can well wait till the next meeting of the Council, and come for a supplementary demand. There should be some facts stated, Mr. President, which would satisfy this Council that before August next the department would spend Rs. 3,90,000 and also at least some portion, if not the whole of the extra Rs. 3,56,400. I therefore submit that if these further demands are to be encouraged in this fashion, surrenders will become frequent, the spending departments will exercise no control over their expenditure and will merely depend upon Government moving further demands before this House. In any case, it is not a new matter or a new service necessitating or justifying a further demand."

* Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao :—"I also wish to oppose the demand on its merits. The electricity schemes are no doubt good in themselves and help the industrial development. But spending huge sums on these big schemes at this stage when we are defective in irrigation schemes, for example the Tungabhadra and Kistna projects which would fertilise an arid area which is suffering from constant droughts, when money is not forthcoming for such schemes that we should think of investigating into big Hydro-electric schemes and give electricity to some areas is premature. We want food first and then these luxuries and other comforts. So far as this scheme is concerned, it helps the municipality of Ootacamund and a number of tea plantations. The municipality of Ootacamund can better take care of itself by getting some loan from the Government and carrying on its own electric schemes and the tea plantations also may be left to take care of themselves. Except for those two parties just now the scheme is admittedly not useful. As this is a huge scheme known as the Pykbara scheme, I object that huge commitments

26th March 1929] [Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.]

be made to these schemes. Of course, if I am not going on an indelicate ground, we people who are agitating for separating the Andhra districts into a separate province have to object. Another reason is that most of the money that is now sanctioned for this scheme will be spent in purchasing machinery in England. The complaint about the Mettur project has been that there has not been sufficient advertisement in the papers on the Continent and America and that the special officer has been sent direct to England for purchasing all the machinery there. These electrical schemes are naturally of huge machinery, and in the present circumstances this money is being spent by the executive which is not responsible to the Legislature. It is expected that these sums will be spent for the benefit of the British manufacturers at great loss to the taxpayer of this country. The machinery is known to be cheaper and at least as efficient on the Continent and also in America than in England and therefore any risk of benefiting the manufacturers of Great Britain to the detriment of the Indian taxpayer has also to be avoided. Therefore, I think that any money to be spent on these electric schemes would be a waste or at any rate will not be so useful as they would be if the schemes are postponed till we get full responsible Government. I would therefore object to the taking up of the scheme at this stage."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I have very little to add. As a matter of fact my friend Mr. Swami Nayudu opposed the motion for the grant itself when the demand for the hydro-electric scheme came before the House and Mr. Wood on that occasion and my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar on that occasion as well as on the present occasion and my friend Mr. Gopala Menon on the present occasion have answered all the criticisms. I do not think there is any necessity to spend more time of the Council in my answering to the objection now raised."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

III

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1928-29.

GRANT XXVII—FISHERIES—TRANSFERRED.

12-30 p.m.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding* Rs. 16,380 *under Grant XXVII—Fisheries—Transferred*'."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXIV—AGENCY TRACTS—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding* Rs. 100 *under Grant XXXIV—Agency Tracts—Reserved*'.

" Sir, this is a token demand for obtaining the approval of the House for certain works being undertaken in regard to urgent repairs to the roof of